

*Pam 39*  
**S T R I C T U R E S**

In Vindication of some of the

**D O C T R I N E S**

MISREPRESENTED

By Mr. FOOT in his two Pamphlets

ENTITLED,

OBSERVATIONS UPON THE NEW OPINIONS

OF

**J O H N H U N T E R,**

In his late TREATISE on the

**V E N E R E A L D I S E A S E;**

**I N C L U D I N G**

**M R. P O T T ' S P L A G I A R I S M S A N D M I S I N F O R M A T I O N**

**O N T H E**

SUBJECT of Pus or MATTER, in his OBSERVATIONS on that DISORDER  
of the Corner of the EYE, commonly called

**F I S T U L A L A C H R Y M A L I S.**

---

By **T. B R A N D,**

MEMBER of the CORPORATION of SURGEONS, LONDON, and SURGEON EXTRAORDINARY  
to his MAJESTY'S ROYAL HOSPITAL at GREENWICH.

---

**L O N D O N:**

Printed for G. NICOL, Bookseller to his Majesty, Strand; J. BEW, Pater-noster Row;  
T. MURRAY, Fleet Street; and J. DEBRET, Piccadilly.

**MDCCLXXXVII.**

ST R I C T U R E S

D O C T R I N E S

B A T T L E S

O B S E R V A T I O N S

J O H N H U N T

A D E D



THE

OF

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE



T O T H E  
R E A D E R.

---

THE following strictures occurred in consequence of reading the first and second parts of Mr. FOOT's Observations upon Mr. HUNTER's treatise on the venereal disease. By publishing them, I do not mean to convey to the world an idea, that the merits of Mr. HUNTER's work have suffered in the opinions of those who take the trouble of judging for themselves. But I cannot help thinking the Observations neither fair nor founded; and that if they had been suffered to pass unnoticed, it would have been a reflection against those who had studied under Mr. HUNTER. Had I been induced to do this merely from personal regard, it is a motive that I would not have been averse to acknowledge. But the fact is, that no common pains seem to have been taken to mislead the public; and if it shall prove that Mr. HUNTER's opinions have been misrepresented, I hope my endeavours to vindicate the truth will not be less esteemed, because that truth has been violated in the person of a friend.

*Soho Square, 16th April, 1787.*

T O T H E

R E V I S E D

E R R A T A.

P. 16. l. 4, for *viations* read *deviations*.

l. 6 from the bottom, for *poisons vegetable*, &c. read *poisons animal*,  
*vegetable*, &c.

P. 44. l. 11, for *could* read *would*.



## STRICTURES, &c.

**I** CONSIDER myself (says Mr. FOOT, p. 2.) in the situation of a Counsellor at the Bar, in a cause at issue."

It will strike every sensible man, that nothing could be better imagined; as the manners assumed by Counsellors, when introduced into the discussion of philosophical questions, must be attended with considerable advantages. The plain and decent language of philosophy is dull and unentertaining. It is only suited to mere matter-of-fact-writers; but, to men of wit, it must be uneasy and cumbersome.

As a Counsel, we must believe, that Mr. FOOT has attended to the interest of his client (whoever he be) and followed the instructions of his brief. What fee he received is nobody's concern but his own. But it is as singular to hear of a Counsel pleading without a Judge or a Jury, as it is improbable that Gentlemen of this description would plead without a brief and a fee. And yet there is neither Judge nor Jury mentioned. Let us try if we can supply these glaring defects.

In the appointment of a Judge, the chief difficulty is, to fix upon a man possessed of knowledge, fidelity and impartiality. Who can be proposed, against whom envy or reason will not urge some objection?

In order to cut this matter short, let it be supposed, no matter how improbable, that Mr. WATSON was held competent to fill the important office. I shall not enlarge upon his candour or liberality, but observe, that he possesses, at least, one of the properties of a Judge—

A

I mean

I mean his wig. And as I do not at this moment recollect any other Surgeon in London, who wears this professional badge with more distinguished peculiarity than himself, I must beg that he may be permitted to pass.

Let the Public at large be the Jury.

*Interdum vulgus rectum videt.*—H O R.

These preliminaries being settled, we shall proceed without any further ceremony to the observations, and probably I shall sometimes consider them not only as the speech of a Counsellor, but as a pamphlet, printed to be examined.

Perhaps an examination of Mr. FOOT's observations might be made under the two heads of beauties and blunders, as under one or the other of these distinctions many of them could be fairly comprised. There is nothing middling to be found, for every passage appears, on examination, to be a beauty or a blunder, or something worse.

Mr. FOOT, by way of address to the reader, has opened his observations with the following flight of Persian allegory. "A giant (says he) is never seen to so great advantage, as when a dwarf is placed by his side. The most eminent painters have availed themselves of the *high effect* of *contrast*, and express it upon canvases. The most beautiful prospects in nature attract our admiration from the same result."

It is impossible that the compliment conveyed here to Mr. HUNTER's work can require any illustration. Is it not clearly demonstrated, that, whenever a great work like Mr. HUNTER's is published, a little work like Mr. FOOT's should also come out, in order that we may avail ourselves of the high effect of contrast, and be enabled to admire it sufficiently?

But there are some people of an obstinate turn, who will insist, that the merit of a book does not depend merely on its comparative size, and that it is the truth and knowledge it contains alone, that must determine its intrinsic value. Such people may take it into their heads to question, why a giant and a dwarf may not possess equal degrees of



of knowledge, and equal powers of reasoning; and may refuse to respect a giant merely on account of his size, or to despise a dwarf because his figure is diminutive. One party may oppose Mr. FOOT's allegory by saying,

Μίγα βιβλίον, μέγα κακόν.

And another will perhaps please him by crying out,

*Inest sua gratia parvis.*

—“ Whilst (continues Mr. FOOT) the great work of JOHN HUNTER is open before you upon your writing desk, do me the honour “ to take this into your hand.”

The solicitude of an author to be read is surely introduced here in a very judicious and beautiful manner. And what can be more obliging than his telling us of a proper posture? Without this piece of instruction, there are very few surgeons, perhaps, that would have known how to have considered them.

I am afraid the allegory of the giant and the dwarf will not pass! 'Tis a figure of rhetoric that seems better suited to a mere seller of books than a professional man. Mr. FOOT seems here not to have done the brilliancy of his fancy or himself justice. I by no means profess to understand the art of fabricating allegory; but, judging as a surgeon, I might suppose that something like the following would have been more in character. He might have said:

“ The allegory of a giant and a dwarf, which first presented itself to my imagination, I find too limited to express my ideas. Besides, it is the pride of surgery to study nature in her proper dress, and not to travel beyond her natural bounds, when its purpose can be fulfilled within them. A giant or a dwarf can be considered only as *lusus naturæ*. I shall therefore leave them to painters and poets, and endeavour to find out beings within the limits of nature, to dress out my ideas with.”

“ If in the course of my observations, any thing which I meant only as severe, should be mistaken for malevolence, some malicious

person might turn this beautiful allegory against myself, by observing how ridiculous a dwarf would make himself, by attempting to correct the manners of a giant, and with what composure and pity his railings would be treated."

"Against such severity and triumph, I shall provide in the most ample manner, because my observations shall be conducted on the true principles of enquiry; they shall be candid, liberal and intelligent."

"Though I have laid aside the allegory of the giant and the dwarf, don't let it be imagined, that I am ignorant of extremes. A man and an ouran-outang are capital extremes, but I need not insist upon that now. All that I mean to observe, is, that the dignity of man could not be illustrated to greater advantage, than when an ouran-outang is placed by his side."

Here indeed Mr. FOOT would be within the bounds of nature. The man and the ouran-outang are of the same genus though not of the same species. It is the same with a quarto and an octavo, which form the basis of Mr. FOOT's allegory of the giant and the dwarf, and therefore it might justly claim the precedence.

But leaving the flowery and extravagant paths of allegory entirely out of the question, and descending to plain truth, a writer who really was acquainted with Mr. HUNTER and engaged to make observations on his work, would express himself to the following purport.

"When we read the work of a man whose whole life has been devoted to the great cause of humanity, the least we owe to him, and the least we owe to ourselves, is a respectful attention. When we see such a man, at a time when he has reached the highest pinnacle of professional fame, and is enjoying its rewards, active to promulgate the effects of the severest studies—When his doctrines bear the genuine marks of philosophic coolness and discretion—When his ideas are enlightened by philosophy, and his mind directed by the purest principles of philanthropy. With a disposition in which no selfish idea can be traced, and as ready to communicate, as he has been distinguished for his zeal and industry in acquiring knowledge.—I say, a writer who could put these truths of Mr. HUNTER into an elegant shape, might ask :



ask:—Can we read the work of such a man, and not feel the warmest sentiments of reverence, gratitude and admiration, towards him? But as Mr. FOOT did not study under Mr. HUNTER, and only knows him as he has occasionally met him in the way of his profession, perhaps he has no idea of these facts. There are even some, who know Mr. HUNTER, who dare not allow him his merits, or at least, do not. There is, therefore, some excuse for Mr. FOOT, who knows little or nothing of him, nor of his opinions.

Before I enter into an examination of the more important particulars of Mr. FOOT's observations, it will be proper to take some notice of what he has thrown out by way of exordium.

It may appear a little extraordinary, but the first mistake, that presents itself, happens in what we shall call Mr. FOOT's title page.

It promises observations upon the *new* opinions of Mr. HUNTER,—ending with the subject of gonorrhœa, and second part of his work.

Upon examination, we have the misfortune to find, that Mr. FOOT's observations by no means correspond with the title. As to making observations upon the *new* opinions of Mr. HUNTER: the fact is, that he has entirely passed over the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth sections of Mr. HUNTER's introduction; and yet this introduction is expressly given as a short explanation of some of the many opinions respecting the animal œconomy peculiar to himself.

In so formal a business, professedly written to make observations upon the *new* opinions of Mr. HUNTER, it must appear very unaccountable that five sixths of the very essence of his new opinions should be passed over.

However, it is but bare justice to acknowledge, that Mr. FOOT has made one observation upon the introduction, which might have escaped an ordinary reader. After taking some notice of the first section, and enumerating the titles of the five others, he informs us, that "*all this is compressed within eight pages.*"

Besides the omissions just stated, I must also beg leave to take notice, that Mr. FOOT has somehow or other entirely passed over the following important sections, that treat, "Of the nature of the poison"—"Of the greater or less acrimony of the poison"—"Of the mode of venereal

neral infection"—"Varieties in different constitutions"—"Of the gonorrhœa in women"—"Of the proofs of a woman having this complaint"—"Of the effects of the gonorrhœa on the constitution in both sexes," &c.

In one instance, at least, we find Mr. FOOT has even mistated the title of the section, for in page 89, he terms it, "Of the chordee," whereas Mr. HUNTER gives it, "Of the treatment of the chordee;" and to conclude this part of the business, we also find, that Mr. FOOT's observations, instead of ending with the second part of Mr. HUNTER's work, go no farther than to page 91, although the subject of gonorrhœa extends to page 108.

If one might be permitted to consider Mr. FOOT's observations merely as a pamphlet, and not as a speech at bar, I am afraid, that under the circumstances just stated, it would be considered as little better than a catch-penny production.

One of the most palpable, or perhaps one of the most laudable designs in Mr. FOOT's observations, is discoverable in the following passage, which is a continuation of his address to the reader.

"To those (says he) who have not already purchased that great work (Mr. HUNTER's) I have to observe, that I have *faithfully* given as far as I have already gone, the material text of the original, upon which my comment is formed."

Now this is not said for the purpose of preventing any person from buying Mr. HUNTER's book. No such thing. Mr. FOOT only means to inform those who like to buy their knowledge in a very frugal manner, that here is near one third of Mr. HUNTER's work, ornamented with observations, for two and sixpence. And if you have not *already* purchased that *great work*, which costs a guinea, you are likely to get the whole of it for three half crowns, with his observations into the bargain: for in page vi. Mr. FOOT tells us, "And to all my readers I promise, to persist in my review of the *whole* of his (Mr. HUNTER's) treatise at my first leisure hours."

This method of making observations, provided it was really executed in the way promised above, could not be termed a mere act of simple plagiarism. It would be nothing less, than downright plundering



plundering an author of his labours, and retailing them at less than half price, even allowing nothing for Mr. FOOT's trouble.

Had Mr. FOOT really given the quotations he has made, or, as he terms it, the material text, *faithfully*, there could not have been a difficulty in deciding upon this question. But we shall find that he has made a material mistake in this matter; for the truth is, and it will be seen presently, that Mr. FOOT, instead of giving Mr. HUNTER's text *faithfully*, has very essentially altered and misrepresented it, and thereby conveyed very erroneous and untrue ideas of Mr. HUNTER's opinions.

Mr. FOOT tells us page 1:

"It is the duty of every professional man to combat such opinions in science, as are either not founded in truth, or would be pernicious in practice. Speculative innovations (continues he) which tend more to bewilder than to inform, and which are proposed merely to obtain a name, are doubtless worthy of reprehension."

"I therefore shall assert my right of offering to the public my objections to the new opinions of JOHN HUNTER in his late treatise on the venereal disease. Because I cannot permit, as an individual in the profession of surgery, that doctrines I find extrayagant should pass, at least without remark, or that they should be received without my protest."

It must be very obvious, that when an author's doctrines are not extrayagant—one of the readiest ways to render them so, is to misrepresent them. Whether Mr. FOOT has done this, or whether he has written only to obtain a name, will presently appear. In the mean time it is very safe to declare, that these two passages merely beg the question, for Mr. FOOT has not established one of the facts upon which his position rests.

The next three pages and a half, which I consider as Mr. FOOT's *exordium*, contain so many extraordinary beauties and fallies of eccentricity, that it would not be doing him justice, if I passed them over. His beauties, however, are chequered with a portion of mistakes, which I suppose are intended to maintain what he calls "the high effect of contrast."

Without

Without any authority, Mr. FOOT has thought proper to give Mr. HUNTER the title of professor. Considered as one of the common arts of antagonists, to raise the consequence of an adversary, it is even too gross and offensive. It is my business to observe, that Mr. HUNTER neither assumes, nor courts any title that does not belong to him; and that Mr. FOOT, in this particular, has, under some very unfortunate mistake, foisted in a term which has no foundation in truth. To a man like Mr. HUNTER, whose contempt of parade forms one of his principal characteristics, and who still adheres to his primitive plainness of manners, such an impropriety, it must have been well known, could not fail of being particularly disgusting. The title of professor occurs so frequently, that it was necessary to take some notice of it, as in quoting Mr. FOOT, it will be unavoidable to repeat it, and the reader might otherwise have been at a loss to know who is meant.

Let us proceed to the next passage in Mr. FOOT's *exordium*. He tells us, p. 2. "Throughout my objections I wish it to be understood, that it is the theory of the professor that stands in my way, and not the professor himself. No intention can be further from me than personal attack. If I sting his theory, I mean to leave the man harmless."

The candid manner, in which Mr. FOOT has assured us, that it is not Mr. HUNTER, but his theory that stands in his way, must yield particular comfort and satisfaction to Mr. HUNTER and his friends. I speak for myself, at least, and the world will no doubt believe that I am most perfectly serious.

That a man is to be left harmless, if his theory should be stung, is a figure of rhetoric that does not appear to come within the limits of common sense.

"If I sting his theory"—Though the idea of stinging an author's theory is a little *outré*, yet the *if* marks a diffidence which is very engaging. "I mean to leave the man (Mr. HUNTER) harmless."—There is no doubt but Mr. FOOT's meaning is very good, and therefore we will proceed to his other matter to be convinced.

Mr.



Mr. FOOT, after paying to himself a proper compliment on "the diffidence that alarms him and his most implicit submission," launches forth into the regions of panegyric; and, after applying, in one way or other, to Mr. HUNTER, most of the qualities necessary to professional eminence, wishes it could go farther, "but here it must stop."

It is impossible to say, how far Mr. FOOT wished to go, but he seems to have gone a little beyond what could come within his own particular knowledge. For (says Mr. FOOT, page 3) "who does not applaud him to the very echo for his *knowledge in comparative anatomy?*"

If Mr. FOOT had studied under Mr. HUNTER, or if he had had opportunities of knowing that Mr. HUNTER possessed this kind of knowledge, we might have been delighted with the "applaud to the very echo;" even as it is, I must observe, that, for my own part, after what Mr. FOOT has said, I hardly know what he would have, unless he means to insist, that Mr. HUNTER ought to possess more qualifications than come to the share of any one man. Mr. HUNTER, we find, has already a sufficient share to rouse envy and detraction. But by the colour of Mr. FOOT's expressions, we are led to believe, that if Mr. HUNTER joined to his professional skill and philosophic penetration, the oratory of a FOX, and the beautiful style of a BURKE, still Mr. FOOT would not have been perfectly contented, but warmed with an excessive respect for the honour of his profession, would have insisted, that Mr. HUNTER should receive a few lessons from LE PICQ, the dancing-master, by way of producing a finished philosopher and an accomplished surgeon.

Mr. FOOT has told us, and, undoubtedly, it is a very important piece of information, that when *unfortunately* he has been obliged to have recourse to chirurgical aid, Mr. HUNTER has not always been the person whose *opinion* he has *invoked*.

Most people consider chirurgical aid as one of their most *fortunate* resources, when they stand in need of it. But it is not an easy matter to determine whether we should most admire, Mr. FOOT's intelligence, or the beautiful manner in which he has expressed it.

All the world has heard of invoking gods and goddesses, of ghosts, dæmons and the muses—but the thought of *invoking* a surgeon's opinion,

is, I believe, peculiar to Mr. FOOT. If this mode of expression must be adopted, it will certainly be necessary that the surgeons' company should be classed with some of those supernatural beings, which are usually addressed in this way. The master and wardens of the company, in settling this point, would perhaps find least difficulty in being admitted to the class of ghosts or devils; but as it is ten to one but they would wish to remain what they are, mere mortal men, the term *invoke*, however grand it may appear, must be laid aside, and surgeons remain contented to be employed like other professional men.

But the idea of *invoking* an opinion which may be honestly purchased for a guinea, and even got for nothing by those who cannot afford to pay, appears to carry something ridiculous in its face. Yet we must not form hasty conclusions. Under this extravagant expression, it is not impossible, but Mr. FOOT may have some allusion to those patients, who serve their surgeons as bad poets serve the muses—that is, they solicit, or, as he calls it, invoke their aid with mighty great promises, but in the end, yield nothing but disappointment and ingratitude in return.

Mr. FOOT, getting warmer and warmer, now takes a flight, which even surpasses all that he has hitherto given us. He speaks of *venereal redemption*. This expression may be consistent with the subject, with decency, good order and good sense, but I confess I cannot think so.

After these sallies of wit, or whatever else they may be termed, Mr. FOOT goes on, and adds (page 3.) “Considering myself now in full possession of the attention of my readers, I shall proceed with my *objections*, but not without begging their patience, which I do *most chearfully*, as I KNOW *that they feel* towards the professor as I do, not in the least wearied out by *unintelligible abstruseness* or contrary assertions.”

Mr. FOOT we find is so modest, that he will not proceed without begging his reader's patience, and this he does most chearfully—why?—because (but God knows how) he knows that the readers feel toward the professor as he does, &c.

Mr. FOOT, in a preceding passage has said something about a *prophecy* that was *foretold*; by which, I suppose, he means to make an accurate distinction between prophecies foretold and prophecies not foretold. But his assertion that he knows the readers feel toward Mr. HUNTER as he does



does undoubtedly beats the prophecy all to pieces——It can be reckoned nothing less than downright conjuration.

But the most curious part of this passage, is, that having got possession of his reader's attention, he is to proceed with his objections upon what he has been pleased to term *unintelligible abstruseness*.

There are few observers, I believe, who have exhibited such a degree of openness and candour, as fairly to confess, and in such strong terms, that they had written a half crown pamphlet of observations upon a work that is unintelligible to them.

Such an undertaking is undoubtedly very extraordinary ; but far be it from me to doubt Mr. FOOT's veracity. That Mr. HUNTER's work is unintelligible abstruseness to him, we shall readily believe : but I am utterly at a loss to conceive by what art, or by what peculiar powers of intellect he has written 110 pages of observations on a book, which appears to him unintelligible abstruseness. There is some terrible blunder here, somewhere or other, nor is it mended by Mr. FOOT's supposing that the reader would not be wearied out ; for that is paying his reader's understanding a very poor compliment indeed.

Mr. FOOT, having so far sported his own fancy, takes the natural turn of a skilful writer, and begins to exhibit his erudition. Yet the two following elegant passages might have stood their ground by their own intrinsic merit ; but Mr. FOOT, approaching near the end of his exordium, we perceive was determined to keep up the spirit of it——and proceeds

“ *Nullum numen abest, si sit prudentia,*

“ said JUVENAL. But how came the professor so much off his guard, “ as not to retain that propitious guardian in his service ? (Mr. FOOT goes on in the following delicate language) “ Was there not one of his “ friends at his elbow to put him in mind of such necessary precaution ? “ No one to lay before him the danger of embarking as an author ? No “ one to tell him that the highest point of honour is the pinnacle of “ danger, from which he may topple with precipitation ? The opportunities in his early life, that Dr. HUNTER's dissecting room afforded, “ would have made a dunce useful ; how then could they fail to make

“ the professor a proficient?—Why did he mistake the mechanism of  
 “ anatomy for surgical superiority?

There is no maxim more generally admitted than that it is easier to give advice than to take it. Whether Mr. FOOT's attention to prudence as a writer be exemplary, it is not my business to discuss. But it does appear by the paragraph just quoted from him, that, as the opportunities of a dissecting room must have made Mr. HUNTER a proficient, what a pity it was that no friend happened to be at his elbow, to warn him of the danger of embarking as an author.

Without genius and assiduity, I deny that the opportunities of a dissecting room, would have made Mr. HUNTER a proficient. And if his knowledge was merely that of an anatomist, it is very improbable that he would have risen so high in the practice of surgery. But at any rate, I believe, it is generally admitted, that the danger of embarking as an author, whatever that may be, depends chiefly on a man's not being a proficient. However, Mr. FOOT seems to be of a contrary opinion, and indeed, with regard to freedom of style, a certain degree of ignorance may be advantageous to the writer.

*Mens sine pondere ludit.*

But let us go on to the next passage.

“ I hope, continues Mr. FOOT, the professor will take this in good  
 “ part (essence of goodness in Mr. FOOT!) and that he is disposed to  
 “ put on as cheerful a countenance as I am.—As his theory goes only  
 “ to sympathy in pain, I wish to sympathize with him in pleasure.”

Mr. FOOT delighted with the idea of pleasure, forgets that he has expressed a mortal aversion to the term sympathy. He has even called it an imposition. Whether Mr. HUNTER is likely to take the observations in good part, we shall be better able to judge by the time we have seen how faithfully Mr. FOOT has conducted them.

We are now arrived at the last passage of the exordium, in which he tells us, that “ The professor complains that his opinions have made their  
 “ way into the world under other names. I wish to know (continues  
 “ Mr. FOOT) who they are that entertain them.”

Mr.



Mr. FOOT might have saved himself the trouble of asking this question by consulting the modern books of physic and surgery, in some of which, I think, I could point out, not only Mr. HUNTER's opinions without being acknowledged, but his opinions expressed almost in his own words, and in others grossly misrepresented.

That Mr. HUNTER has not complained without good foundation cannot be denied; and when Messrs. Sharpe, Gataker, and Pott make their appearance, which they will do, we shall be better able to determine whether he has not had great reason to complain.

—" Let us proceed (says Mr. FOOT) to examine the professor's budget of *new* opinions, beginning with his *introduction*.

That the reader may be enabled to form an opinion, by comparing what Mr. HUNTER has said, and what Mr. FOOT has said for him, I intend to give the whole of Mr. FOOT's observations on the introduction and on chap. I. By comparing the real text of Mr. HUNTER, which I shall also give, with that which Mr. FOOT has substituted for it, the reader will be enabled to determine how faithfully the material text has been quoted by Mr. FOOT, and whether his objections are conducted upon the principles of fairness, or are founded in fact or sound argument.

Mr. HUNTER commences with the

## I N T R O D U C T I O N.

" I am induced (says Mr. HUNTER) by two motives to publish the following treatise:—In the first place, I am in hopes that several new observations contained in it will be deemed worthy of the public attention; in the next place, I am desirous to have an opportunity of asserting my right to some opinions that have made their way into the world under other names."

" There are many opinions respecting the animal œconomy peculiar to myself, which are frequently referred to in the course of the work. It is therefore necessary to give a short explanation of some of them, that the terms made use of may be better understood."

I. *Of Sympathy.*

" I divide sympathy (continues Mr. HUNTER) into two kinds;  
" *universal* and *partial*.

" Universal sympathy is when the whole constitution sympathises  
" with some sensation or action. Partial sympathy is, when one or more  
" distinct parts sympathise with some local sensation or action.

" The universal sympathies are various in different diseases; but those  
" that we have in the venereal disease are principally two, the symptoma-  
" tic fever and the hectic fever. The symptomatic fever is an immediate  
" effect of some local injury, and seldom takes place in the venereal  
" disease, in any great degree, under any of its forms, except in the case  
" of a *swelled testicle*, which is itself *an instance of a partial sympathy*; the  
" symptomatic fever here, therefore, is an universal sympathy arising  
" from a partial one. The hectic fever is an universal sympathy with a  
" local disease, which the patient is not able to overcome. This takes  
" place oftener, and in a greater degree in the *lues venerea*, than in any  
" other form of the disease.

" Partial sympathy I divide into three kinds; the *remote*, the *conti-*  
" *guous*, and the *continuous*. The remote is when there appears to be no  
" visible connection of parts that can account for such effects, as the pain  
" of the shoulder in an inflammation of the liver. The contiguous is  
" that which appears to have no other connection than what arises from  
" the contact or vicinity of separate parts; an instance of which we have  
" in the stomach and intestines, sympathising with the integuments of  
" the abdomen. The continuous is where there is no interruption of  
" parts, and the sympathy runs along from the irritating point as from a  
" center, which is the most common of all the sympathies, and we have  
" an example of it in the spreading of inflammation."

HUNTER'S *Treatise on Ven. Disease*, Introd. p. p. 1. 2.

Let the reader now peruse what Mr. FOOT has given as a quotation  
from Mr. HUNTER, together with his observations.



I. *On Sympathy.*

“ This he tells us is one of his *new opinions*, and explains it as applicable to those affections from venereal poison which have been hitherto understood to be inflammation in any particular part, arising from the translation of venereal poison to that part.

“ The professor tells us, “ *that the swelling of the testicle in consequence of a gonorrhœa is produced from partial sympathy*; and that the symptomatic fever is an universal sympathy with a local disease, which the constitution is not able to overcome. This takes place oftener and in greater degree in the *lues venerea*, than in any other form of the disease.” He goes on to subdivide his sympathies, through which I shall not follow him: I shall content myself with carrying along with me the spirit of his theory, and by applying it to practice as he applies it, examine how far his arguments hold, and what the advantages are that may be derived from this new arrangement; whether the particular distinctions which he makes be in terms only; whether they be evident improvements worthy of general adoption; or whether they be not, in many instances, calculated to mislead.”

Mr. Foot then proceeds to favour us with the titles of other parts of the introduction, but without any comment whatever.

“ II. *Of diseased actions being incompatible with each other.*

“ III. *Of the powers of different parts of the body from situation and from structure.*

“ IV. *Parts susceptible of diseases.*

“ V. *Inflammation.*”

“ VI. *Mortification.*”

“ All this is compressed within eight pages, and I thank the professor for *this brief*. I shall not fail of availing myself of this generous advantage, whenever he brings either of these leading principles into play: I shall watch how they are applied, applaud them when I can, condemn them when I must; being nevertheless resolved where I find them perfectly innocent not to rouse them into action at all!”

I will

I will not pay the reader so bad a compliment, as to offer a single remark on this first instance of Mr. FOOT's objections, but that it is palpably misquoted. And, as we advance, it will be found that the viations from the genuine text do not decrease.

Let the reader peruse the following text from Mr. HUNTER.

## P A R T I

### C H A P T E R I.

#### *Of the Venereal Poison.*

"The venereal disease *arises from a poison*, which as it is produced by disease, and is capable of again producing a similar disease, I call a morbid poison, to distinguish it from the other poisons, animal, vegetable, and mineral.

"The morbid poisons are many, and they have different powers of contamination. Those which infect the body locally or constitutionally, but not in both ways, I call *simple*. Those which are capable of affecting the body, both locally and constitutionally, I call *compound*. The venereal poison when applied to the human body, possesses a power of propagating or multiplying itself; and as it is also capable of acting both locally and constitutionally, it is a *compound morbid poison*. Like all such poisons, it may be communicated to others, in all the various ways in which it can be received, producing the same disease in some one of its forms."

The reader will now be pleased to read the quotation that Mr. FOOT has given for the faithful material text of the original, with his observations.

"The venereal *disease*, (says Mr. FOOT) the professor calls a morbid poison, to distinguish it from other poisons, vegetable, and mineral."

"I (continues Mr. FOOT) call it an animal poison peculiar to man. To call it by any other name, would be admitting that all other animal poisons were possessed of the same properties. Now, as they all differ in their action and effect, I see no reason for calling this a "*morbid*," and not an animal poison."

That



That Mr. FOOT has mutilated the original text, it must be unnecessary to observe. That he has misrepresented it, a very few words will be sufficient to prove.

It will be found that it is a misrepresentation to assert, that Mr. HUNTER calls the venereal disease a morbid poison.

By consulting the original, it will be found that Mr. HUNTER says, "*the venereal disease ARISES from a poison,*"—which poison is described by Mr. HUNTER, not (as Mr. FOOT says) as a morbid, but as a *compound morbid poison*.

Tedious it would be to the reader, and tiresome to myself, were I to dwell upon every exceptionable part of the observations, and pursue them to their extreme ramifications. I shall content myself with keeping as much as possible on the broad and clear ground of exception.

Let us examine Mr. FOOT's definition of the venereal disease. "I," says he, "call the venereal disease an animal poison peculiar to man." This assertion is bold, but unfortunately it does not appear to be in his or any other man's power to advance it upon good ground.

It is not very improbable that Mr. FOOT took up this idea of the venereal disease being peculiar to man, from what Mr. HUNTER has said, p. 20, where we find, that he had repeatedly soaked lint in matter from a gonorrhœa, chancre and bubo, and introduced it into the vagina of bitches, and asses, and, also under the prepuce of dogs, without producing any effect; besides he has made incisions, and introduced this matter under the skin of dogs and asses, yet nothing but a common sore was produced.

The question is, has Mr. FOOT made experiments upon every other animal, except those mentioned by Mr. HUNTER? I believe it may be answered that he has not.

But such is the obvious want of foundation in Mr. FOOT's definition, that it is more than probable, it never will be in any man's power to make it upon authority. Mr. FOOT must assure us, that he has actually made experiments upon all animals, otherwise he cannot expect that any regard will be paid to what he has advanced.

So far little more has been necessary than to oppose Mr. HUNTER's real text to that which Mr. FOOT has substituted for it, with his observa-

tions, or what he has called his objections, to the *new* opinions of Mr. HUNTER, yet the reader must have begun to form some opinion of the merits of the case. Perhaps no answer to Mr. FOOT's observations would be more proper than merely to set down Mr. HUNTER's text over against them.

From p. 8 to p. 16 of Mr. FOOT's pamphlet, scarce any thing is worthy of attention. Several important parts are entirely omitted by Mr. FOOT, and those he has taken notice of are without the original text from Mr. HUNTER, except about four lines, and even these are not according to the words of the original, as we shall see.

By omitting the original text, Mr. FOOT has saved himself a repetition of charges for misrepresentation, but how does he acquit himself of his engagement with the public, which he has made in the following words:—"To those who have not already purchased that great work  
" (Mr. HUNTER's) I have to observe, that I have faithfully given,  
" as far as I have already gone, *the material text of the original, upon which*  
" *my comment is formed.*"

How near about four lines of Mr. FOOT's pamphlet is to faithfully giving the material text of about nineteen pages of Mr. HUNTER's, I shall leave for others to determine.

I shall now beg leave to apprize the reader, that he will find Mr. FOOT speaking of Mr. HUNTER's modesty, in what immediately follows. If it had no other claim than this to be noticed, candour would oblige me to introduce it,

#### C H A P T E R IV.

##### *Of the Lues Venerea being the Cause of other Diseases.*

Mr. FOOT tells us, "The professor observes that the lues venerea  
" rouses into action scrofula, cancer and other diseases, where there is a  
" predisposing cause in the constitution, and with much modesty (Mr.  
" HUNTER) concludes, that *it is impossible to take notice of every va-*  
" *riety of symptoms, but that, if his general principles be just, they will help*  
" *to explain most of the singularities of the disease.*"

"If (continues Mr. FOOT) the professor had, throughout his work,  
" measured the truth of his new opinions by the uniformity they  
" should



“ should have produced, if his above observation had been *his rule of*  
 “ *right*, we should have had no occasion to remark the contrary effects,  
 “ and all have received profit where we have met with disappoint-  
 “ ment.”

That the reader may have a just idea what Mr. HUNTER has really said, I will give the passage from the original text with its preceding context.

“ In describing diseases (says Mr. HUNTER, p. 28.) which like the  
 “ venereal disease, admit of a great variety of symptoms, we should keep  
 “ a middle line, first giving the most common symptoms of the disease  
 “ in each form, then the varieties which most commonly occur, and  
 “ last of all the most uncommon—but it WILL BE impossible to take  
 “ notice of every possible variety, THEREFORE WHEN A VARIETY  
 “ OCCURS NOT MENTIONED, IT IS NOT TO BE SUPPOSED  
 “ THAT THE AUTHOR IS LEADING HIS READERS ASTRAY,  
 “ OR IS UNACQUAINTED WITH THE DISEASE AT LARGE;  
 “ FOR IF *his general principles ARE just, they will help to explain most*  
 “ *of the singularities of the disease.*”

The only remark necessary to be made on this part is, that Mr. FOOT has made a quotation from Mr. HUNTER, which is not faithful to the material text.

Mr. FOOT would seem to pay Mr. HUNTER a compliment here. But I confess the observation about measuring the truth of new opinions, and the rule of right, and meeting with disappointment, form such a combination that I cannot take upon me to unravel it, and discover what is precisely meant. Yet such is Mr. FOOT's observation, and I have done it all the justice in my power, by giving it in *statu quo*.

### Gonorrhœa.

The evident purport of Mr. FOOT's observations on this chapter of Mr. HUNTER's work, is, to make us believe, that Mr. HUNTER has given the discharge the unqualified appellation of pus—and then to start Mr. FOOT as an authority to prove that this discharge is not matter but an increased secretion.

Mr. FOOT, in order to effect this, has been under the necessity of misrepresenting Mr. HUNTER's text. Besides this, we shall also find, that he has passed over a section which gives a direct negative to his assertion.

Few writers, before Mr. FOOT, have congratulated their readers upon their arrival, "at the immediate subject of gonorrhœa;" but I will give his own words.

"At length (says Mr. FOOT, p. 16.) we are arrived at the immediate subject of gonorrhœa, and I congratulate my readers upon it; for upon this theme, ingenious as the professor is allowed to be, I think he will not have the opportunity of flourishing beyond all comparison."

Admitting that in the pure article of flourishing Mr. HUNTER has very slender pretensions, let us proceed to Mr. FOOT's quotation in support of his assertion, that Mr. HUNTER has given the gonorrhœal discharge, the unqualified appellation of pus.

"He (meaning Mr. HUNTER) tells us, and very properly, "that when an irritating matter of any kind is applied to a secreting surface, it encreases that secretion; but he tells us also, but not with the same propriety, that this irritating matter changes the secretion, which in the present disease is pus."

It is worthy of remark, that although Mr. FOOT has repeated this quotation in different ways several times in the course of this part, yet he has uniformly made Mr. HUNTER say pus, and not *a* pus agreeable to the original text.

This must be admitted as a clear and decided proof that the original text has been misrepresented. Yet I shall not rest the refutation of Mr. FOOT's assertion upon this alone.

Mr. HUNTER, p. 29, part II. chap. I. "Of Gonorrhœa," says:

"When an irritating matter of any kind is applied to a secreting surface, it increases that secretion, and changes it from its natural state (whatever that be) to some other, which in the present disease is *a* pus."

This is very far from giving the discharge the unqualified appellation of pus. But if we will take the trouble to go a little back to p. 11 of

Mr.



Mr. HUNTER's treatise, we shall there see, that he has not given a decisive opinion upon the question. Speaking of the nature of the poison, which, by the bye, Mr. FOOT has entirely passed over, Mr. HUNTER says—

“ We know nothing of the poison itself, but only its effects on the human body. It is commonly in the form of pus, or united with pus, or some such secretion.”

I again ask the reader, is this giving this discharge the unqualified appellation of pus? Can any thing be more clear from Mr. HUNTER's own words, than that there is no foundation for such an assertion?

And yet, Mr. FOOT, triumphing in his own misrepresentation, asks, page 18.

—“ Why has the professor so roundly given this secreted fluid the *unqualified* appellation of pus?”—

And persisting in the misrepresentation, says, p. 20,—“ I know why the professor persists to call this secreted fluid pus; and my readers shall know it, because Mr. PORT says it is not pus.”—

Among the various attempts at misrepresentation, there is probably no instance in which it has been driven to a greater extreme.

Mr. FOOT, not content with having misquoted the original text—not content with having omitted the section which contains a direct negative to the assertion he has advanced, proceeds to account why Mr. HUNTER has done that, which, in fact, we see he has not done. And as the text now stands, there is an evident defect in the sense in Mr. FOOT's last passage—“ my readers, says he, shall know it, because Mr. PORT says it is not pus.”

Without dwelling upon so glaring a deficiency in the sense, let us correct it, by believing that Mr. FOOT meant to have said, after “ know it,—the reason is, because Mr. PORT says it is not pus.”

Although I am ready to allow Mr. FOOT has a very great degree of discernment, yet I own myself at a loss to discover how he can know Mr. HUNTER's motive for what he has not done.

Mr. FOOT goes on with this subject and says, p. 17, “ For here I mean to make a considerable stand against the professor, and to call to my aid every authority that I can.”

When

When I read this passage first, I expected at least to have found a string of respectable authorities, but alas!

—*Ridiculum acri*

*Fortius et melius, &c.*—H. O. R.

This every authority he can ends in his telling us, p. 20 :

“ I shall content myself with flinging the weight of his (Mr. POTT's) authority into my scale, and then leave it to my readers to determine which of us kicks the beam.”

Having, I believe, made it clearly appear, that Mr. FOOT's assertion, that Mr. HUNTER has given the gonorrhœal discharge the unqualified appellation of pus, is not founded in fact, it might be unnecessary to proceed farther upon the subject, if Mr. POTT had not been quoted as an original authority. Though Mr. HUNTER has not said that the discharge is pus, as stated by Mr. FOOT, yet we shall see that Mr. POTT, on his part, has asserted, that this discharge is not pus, but an increased secretion.

Let us enquire upon what ground Mr. POTT has advanced this opinion, and how far he is entitled to be quoted as the original author of it.

From the writings of Mr. POTT we have at least a right to look for all the advantages which can be derived from long experience. It is said that he has been in the practice of surgery above fifty years, and he appears still to possess an activity of mind and body equal to most men in the meridian of life.

It will not, I believe, be difficult to admit that when Mr. POTT was taught his profession, it could be considered, in this country, as little better than a barbarous trade. On surgery, if it then deserved that title, the rays of philosophy had scarcely dawned, and the few that can be traced appear so scattered and feeble, as to have afforded little or no assistance to enlighten the dark ignorance under which it laboured. Surgery could not then be considered as a branch of philosophy. It's offices were commonly performed by barbers, and probably for no better reason than farriers, or men who make and put on the shoes of horses, are now supposed to understand their disorders.



We may consider Mr. POTT as having grown up with the profession in this country, these last fifty years. To a studious man, and capable, like him, of delivering his opinions in very agreeable language, such a length of time must have afforded advantages which can fall to the lot of very few.

In a man of real judgment and observation, such a wonderful field of experience gives us a right to expect, that his works should shew him to be well considered. As an author of eminence they should manifest a disposition to state facts, rather than to amuse us with idle or fallacious theories. That the facts he advances should have come within his own particular knowledge, or when he profited by the discoveries of others, that he should have the justice, or at least the candour, to inform us to whom he was indebted. We had a right to expect that his facts should be clearly proved or established, that his reasoning should be clear and applicable to the subject, and that his conclusions should be convincing to the understanding, and useful in practice.

I believe I shall make it appear that expectations like these, if raised upon the opinion of Mr. POTT, will turn out to be unfounded and delusive.

Mr. POTT is quoted as a sufficient authority to prove, that the gonorrhoeal discharge is *not pus*, but an *increased secretion*.

The weight of, and respect due to, any author's opinion, must depend not only upon his veracity, but principally upon the clearness of the evidence he brings forward to establish the facts upon which his arguments are founded.

What will be said when I inform the reader, that Mr. POTT appears so ignorant of the principal fact, upon which the opinion he has given us depends, that he advances it, not upon his own authority, but upon the testimony of others?

I shall beg the reader to peruse the following quotation, which Mr. FOOT has made from Mr. POTT, with attention.

“ These two fluids, pus and mucus, which have been so frequently  
 “ confounded together, do really differ so widely from each other, in their  
 “ nature, constitution, sources, purposes and effects, that to distinguish  
 “ them properly, and to point out the true character of each, seems to  
 be

“ be a matter of much importance : it would carry me too much from  
 “ my present purpose, to attempt it in this place, and therefore I shall  
 “ only just mention what may serve merely to illustrate that.

“ If I conceive rightly of this affair, mucus, considered in a general  
 “ sense, is the effect of a natural secretion, made by glands, membranes,  
 “ or other bodies appointed for that purpose, and is so far from being  
 “ originally the consequence of disease, that, in a due quantity, it is  
 “ absolutely necessary for several very important purposes, in the animal  
 “ œconomy ; which purposes, when this fluid is deficient, must be ill-  
 “ executed, and some kind of disease or defect follow : whoever will  
 “ reflect upon the uses of it, in the intestines, joints, sheaths or capsulæ  
 “ of the tendons, in the sinuses of the skull serving the purposes of  
 “ speech, in the cavity of the nose, where the olfactory nerves do their  
 “ duty, in the prostate gland, larynx, trachea, urethra and vagina, will  
 “ be easily convinced of the truth of this assertion, both with regard to  
 “ its natural uses in a healthy state and proper quantity, and the share it  
 “ frequently has in the production of diseases, when it is either vitiated  
 “ or redundant.

“ Pus, or matter, is certainly no natural secretion, suppuration, though  
 “ it is an act of nature, when some parts of the body have been forcibly di-  
 “ vided from each other, is nevertheless to be regarded as the effect of vio-  
 “ lence and destruction, at least of division ; for, without entering minutely  
 “ into the origin or nature of it, I believe I may venture to affirm, that the  
 “ dissolution of some of the solid particles of broken capillary vessels, and  
 “ a mixture of some part of the juices which should circulate through  
 “ them, make a necessary part of its production ; however constant its  
 “ appearance may be in the progress towards healing a wound, or sore,  
 “ yet it never is produced, even in the smallest quantity, without some  
 “ degree of erosion, some breach of the natural structure of the parts ;  
 “ and when such breach is healed, the discharge necessarily ceases.

“ On the contrary, mucus may by irritation, relaxation, or defluxion,  
 “ on its secreting or containing parts or organs, be increased to a quantity  
 “ far beyond what is necessary or useful, and produce thereby a disease in  
 “ parts where there is not the least degree of solution of continuity, as in the  
 “ cases of tenesmus stone in the bladder, fluor albus, and simple gleet  
 from



“ from the urethra ; as also in that kind of defluxion on the nose and  
 “ fauces, producing a catarrh, and in the immediate effect of all sternu-  
 “ tories.

“ Other differences between the nature and properties of the two fluids  
 “ might be mentioned ; but if these already cited are just, they will be  
 “ sufficient to evince the impropriety of confounding them together,  
 “ either with regard to theory or practice.

“ Nor is this mistake of discoloured mucus for matter confined to the  
 “ lachrymal sac only ; the two circumstances of pain, and yellow colour,  
 “ having in almost all times produced the same misconception in the  
 “ virulent gonorrhœa of both sexes ; this has been called pus, and being  
 “ said to proceed from ulcerations in the urethra and vagina, though the  
 “ repeated testimony of those who have, immediately after death, exa-  
 “ mined the parts of persons so diseased, has often been produced to the  
 “ contrary, and though the discharge itself, when properly examined,  
 “ will always prove the contrary : inflammation and irritation of the  
 “ membranous linings of the urethra and vagina, will fully account for  
 “ all the appearances in this disease, in which there is neither matter,  
 “ nor ulcer, nor abscess : whoever will attend to the discharge made  
 “ from a purulent ulcer, will find it widely different from that which  
 “ issues from either of the above parts in the gonorrhœa.”

Mr. POTT states, that there is a difference between pus and mucus,  
 as if the fact had been doubted. By whom they have been confounded  
 together, I own I am to learn, for an author so extremely ignorant,  
 as yet, I have not met with.

With whatever parade therefore this difference between *pus* and  
*mucus* be introduced, it is altogether unnecessary ; and Mr. POTT's  
 assertion, that they have been frequently confounded together, is en-  
 tirely imaginary.

To distinguish them properly, and to point out the *true character* of  
 each, Mr. POTT tells us, seems to be a matter of much importance ;  
 and then he says, “ it would carry me too wide from my present pur-  
 “ pose to attempt it in *this place*, and therefore I shall just mention  
 “ what may serve to illustrate that.”

D

When

When I first read this part of Mr. POTT's work, where he points out the importance of the distinction, and immediately after tells us, that it would carry him too wide from his present purpose, to *attempt* it in this place, I own I felt a disappointment. But it was of momentary duration. For he immediately engages with the question, and we have no right to doubt but he has justly and fully delivered all he had to advance upon the subject.

Let us observe how Mr. POTT illustrates what he calls *that*?—He tells us, what every one knew before, that mucus is a discharge made by glands, membranes, or other bodies *appointed*, as he phrases it, for that purpose, and that pus is the effect of disease. We have just seen his own words; and I affirm, that so far he has advanced nothing new to illustrate this difference.

That Mr. POTT was not very well prepared to decide upon the question, we need no greater proof than his advancing the main fact, upon which his arguments depend, upon the testimony of others, and not upon his own, as undoubtedly we had a right to expect.

Perhaps the subject may be rendered a little clearer by taking a brief view of what is, in general, understood by the terms *mucus* and *pus*.

The term *mucus* appears originally to have been applied to that secretion which comes from the nose. But all discharges that are limpid, and in a certain degree viscid, seem to have been comprehended under this general appellation. Of course the discharges from the mouth, nose, lungs, œsophagus, stomach, intestines, urethra, or vagina, go under this term.

These discharges are liable to increase from a variety of causes. Though received under the same general title, yet they are very different in different parts with respect to viscosity, smell, &c. and they are also very different in the same parts, at different times, and under different circumstances.

The term *pus* or matter, is applied to those discharges which spring from sores of all kinds, whether in the state of suppuration, ulceration, or of healing.

Mucus, in a healthy state, in due quantity and consistence, is termed a natural secretion. But this is not because pus is *not* a natural secretion,



tion, but in opposition to the secretion of matter, which is local, and formed in the solid parts of the body when they are separated, laid open, or exposed in some way or other, either by accident or disease.

With regard to pus, though it has also great variety in its consistence, appearance, smell, &c. yet our terms of distinction do not extend beyond laudable and purulent pus.

Every one knows that the mucous discharge from the vagina or urethra in a natural state, is clear, and in some degree viscid.

But when these passages are attacked with gonorrhœa, the discharge becomes coloured, and it's viscosity is altered. It has commonly very much the appearance of matter, and for aught is known, may in truth be this kind of discharge.

The fact is, that the older surgeons were so forcibly struck by its appearance and close semblance to matter, as not only to apply the term to it, but were so satisfied that the gonorrhœal discharge was matter, that they even ventured a little farther than they ought to have done.

For knowing that matter was never formed on the external parts, unless some breach, or separation, of them had taken place, they concluded, that, in the case of gonorrhœa, the urethra must be ulcerated, and so it was generally believed.

To those who are unacquainted how ignorant and careless our forefathers were, it will appear very extraordinary, that until the year 1753, it was generally believed that the matter from the urethra, in a common gonorrhœa, arose from an ulcer or ulcers in that passage. The truth and the misfortune was, that practitioners were too fond of reasoning about facts which could, and ought to have been determined by examination.

If a test was necessary to shew how forcibly Mr. HUNTER's attention has been bent upon the true road of discovery, and how capable he is of applying his discoveries to farther improvement, the business now coming before us would be fully sufficient.

In order to trace the discovery of there being no ulceration in the urethra, in the common gonorrhœa, from its source, I shall go back to the case that gave the first suspicion of the fact.

Mr. FOOT has indeed taken notice of these facts, but in a manner, in my opinion, not so full as they ought to have been.

It appears that in the winter 1749, a child was brought to Dr. HUNTER's for dissection, and upon opening the thorax, a large quantity of pus was found loose, and the surface of the lungs was furred over with a more solid substance, similar to coagulable lymph. On removing this from these surfaces, they were found entire. Here was matter found without breach of substance.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE was not present at the opening of the body, as stated by Mr. FOOT, but he was invited by Dr. HUNTER to see this case. The next year, 1750, Mr. SHARPE published his Critical Enquiry; in which, not much to the honour of his candour, he published this remarkable case, not only without informing us who had shewn it to him, or where he had seen it, but in such a way as if it had been originally discovered by himself. (Vide p. 233, SHARPE's Critical Enquiry.)

Mr. SHARPE's manner of committing this plagiarism is worth reciting "I have also," says he, "lately met with an INSTANCE in a  
" body I DISSECTED, where the operation could hardly have  
" failed of success: it was a large collection of thin matter in the left  
" cavity of the thorax, without the least degree of ulceration or inflam-  
" mation either in the *pleura, mediastinum, or lungs.* I suppose there  
" had been a previous inflammation of these membranes, or of the in-  
" vesting membrane of the lungs, under which circumstance the secre-  
" tion of this matter had been produced, as in inflammations of the  
" prepuce, which also yield the same kind of discharge, exactly resem-  
" bling pus, as I have before mentioned on another occasion."

I shall not dwell upon the confused manner in which Mr. SHARPE has related this case, by first asserting that the discharge was matter, and afterwards *supposing* that there had been a previous inflammation, under which circumstance, the secretion of *this matter* had been produced, as in inflammations of the prepuce, which *also* yield the *same kind of discharge, exactly* RESEMBLING pus. Let us proceed to follow him, and observe the difference between his and Mr. HUNTER's application of this fact.

Mr. SHARPE, we find, grounds upon it an hypothesis, that does not even carry in its face an air of probability: he asserts, that in this case the operation for the empyema could *hardly have failed of success.*

Mr.



Mr. HUNTER pursuing a rational principle of enquiry, tells us, that "he was anxious to examine whether the matter in a gonorrhoea was formed in the same way."

In the spring, 1753, two men were executed, and Mr. HUNTER knew that they had severe gonorrhoeas. He procured the bodies for the purpose of examining whether the general opinion, that there were ulcers in the urethra, was true or not. He found that they were not ulcerated. He tells us "the two urethra's appeared merely a little blood-shot, especially near the glans." Mr. HUNTER also adds, that he has repeatedly made examinations of the same kind, and always found the same appearance. Here is discovery upon fact.

At the time Mr. HUNTER ascertained this fact, Mr. GATAKER happened to be a dissecting pupil under his instructions, at Dr. HUNTER's dissecting room, and had an immediate opportunity of learning what Mr. HUNTER had discovered.

The next year, 1754, Mr. GATAKER, in his turn, actually appropriated this discovery of Mr. HUNTER's to himself, in a pamphlet entitled "Observations on Venereal Complaints in Two Letters to a Surgeon." But who the surgeon was we are at a loss to know. Though the observations seem rather intended for some favorite pupil, who was remarkable for his ignorance or stupidity.

Mr. GATAKER would wish to have it believed that he had made this discovery by dint of discernment, and pretends to have reasoned himself into the fact.

"I shall endeavour," says he, (p. 96.) "to prove that ulcers in the passage are not produced in a gonorrhoea." But how does he prove it? Not by fairly and directly stating the discovery itself, at once, but, after wasting near six pages in frivolous conjectures, he at last states the fact itself, which he has called a circumstance, that the urethra had been examined, and no ulcerations found. But in doing this he seems to have gone beyond the truth: for, says he, "a great number of bodies have been opened, that have died whilst they were affected with this disorder. The state of the parts thus diseased has been carefully examined, and the result of such enquiries has in general contradicted the received opinion of ulcers." I say that Mr. GATAKER seems to have gone beyond

beyond the truth, because it is very improbable that in the year 1754, a great number of bodies had been examined for this purpose.

Having traced the discovery of the fact, let us endeavour to trace the probable ground upon which the discharge from gonorrhœa has been asserted to be mere increase of secretion.

Our forefathers knew, that some breach of substance on the external parts was necessary to produce pus: as the discharge from gonorrhœa was from its appearance pus (which in truth is the only criterion we have yet of judging of it) they concluded, I say, by *reasoning*, that there must be ulcerations in the urethra.

When Mr. HUNTER discovered that there were not ulcerations in the urethra, Mr. GATAKER in committing the plagiarism builds upon it the following hypothesis, that as there are no ulcerations, the discharge is not pus, but an increased secretion.

At first sight there is something plausible in this last supposition, and the assertion must have easily presented itself to a fanciful imagination. But it stands, as we shall find, a mere assertion, unsupported either by proofs, probability or reason.

I must beg leave to observe, that the gonorrhœal discharge has undoubtedly some properties of pus; it is both purulent and laudable; it has the colour and consistence.

What is the ground to suppose the gonorrhœal discharge mere secretion?—The only ground is that there are no ulcerations.—But is this sufficient?—Does any man pretend to say that nature cannot form that secretion called matter, upon internal surfaces, without breach of substance? Besides the natural secretion from the urethra is of itself limpid. A mere increase of it ought also to be limpid. But this is not the fact in gonorrhœa: it is coloured. How then can it be proved to be mere increased secretion?

I shall only add, before I quit Mr. GATAKER, that his hypothesis is attended with some very glaring pieces of ignorance relative to some of the most common, though some of the most troublesome, symptoms of gonorrhœa.

Speaking of the inflammation of the testicles (p. 104.) he says, "This complaint, *you must be sensible*, generally arises from a sudden suppression

" of



“ of running;” and (p. 105.) “ the *humours* are probably *determined* to the testicles.”

In the first he has mistaken the most probable cause for the effect; and the last expression is only fit for a book of farriery.

By entering so fully into the plagiarisms of Messrs. SHARPE and GATAKER, the smallest object I had in view, was their exposure. I found it necessary in order that the reader might have a full view of the discoverer and the fact; and Mr. POTT, though he has given it upon the testimony of others, yet has not informed us, who those others were, whose testimony he alludes to.

I shall now proceed to bring forward, in as concise a manner as I am able, the evidence of Mr. POTT's plagiarism and misrepresentation, on the subject of pus or matter, by pointing out the principal heads.

Whatever merit there may be; of whatever value it may prove to practice; the idea that the gonorrhœal discharge is not pus, but an increased secretion, certainly will be found not to originate with Mr. POTT. It was published by Mr. GATAKER four years before Mr. POTT's pamphlet on the *Fistula Lacrymalis* came out.

Upon comparing the text of Mr. POTT with that of Mr. GATAKER, we shall prove this fact.

In the first place Mr. POTT takes even the idea that the distinction is of importance from Mr. GATAKER: for GATAKER says, p. 95. “ To some it may seem of little *importance*, to know whether the discharge is a real pus or matter flowing *from* ulcers in the passage, or whether it is an increased quantity of the natural mucus, issuing from the glands of the urethra in men, &c.

“ For my own part, *I think* the settling this point a very necessary circumstance.”

And Mr. POTT takes this idea as follows.—“ To distinguish them” (pus and mucus) “ properly, and to point out the true character of each, seems to be a matter of much importance.”

Mr. POTT takes the idea of the appearance of the gonorrhœal discharge being produced by irritation from Mr. GATAKER, p. 101. who says, “ *Whatever irritates* the glands of the urethra, and makes them  
“ yield

" yield an increased quantity of their mucus, &c. will most probably  
 " occasion this appearance of matter," &c.

Mr. P O R T 's plagiarism runs thus :—" Irritation of the membranous  
 " linings of the urethra and vagina will fully account for all the appear-  
 " ances in this disease, in which there is neither matter," &c.

Mr. G A T A K E R, we see, imputes, what he calls the appearance of  
 matter, to irritation ; but he has qualified this opinion by the word pro-  
 bably. Mr. P O R T absolutely commits a plagiarism of the idea of irri-  
 tation, but boldly asserts, without advancing the least evidence to prove  
 it, that irritation will fully account for all the appearances. He has not  
 only committed a plagiarism here, but begged the question, in a very  
 questionable manner.

G A T A K E R, p. 101. " A great number have been opened that have  
 " died whilst they were affected with this disorder. *The state of the parts*  
 " *thus diseased* has been carefully examined, and the result of such en-  
 " quiries has in general contradicted the received opinion of ulcers."

Observe Mr. P O R T. " This has been called pus, and been said to  
 " proceed from ulcerations in the urethra and vagina, though the re-  
 " peated testimony of those who have, immediately after death, examined  
 " the parts of persons so diseased, has often been produced to the con-  
 " trary."

Having clearly established the charge of plagiarism against Mr. P O R T,  
 I shall proceed to examine a little more closely the merits of the opinion  
 he has thus attempted to make his own, and shew where he has advanced  
 misinformation on the subject.

Mr. G A T A K E R, we see, tells us, the very year after Mr. H U N-  
 T E R examined the urethras of the two malefactors, that " A great  
 " number of bodies have been opened that have died whilst they were  
 " affected with this disorder," &c.

If this was true in the year 1754, the very year after Mr. H U N T E R  
 made the discovery, what must we think of Mr. P O R T 's con-  
 descension in having published an opinion upon this fact in the year  
 1758, upon the testimony of others, and not from the authority of his  
 own examination.

It



It must be very obvious, that, in this way, any man, who can write, may become a very voluminous author; but will his writings be considered as valid authority? Can the opinions of any man be looked up to with respect, much less relied upon, who will stoop to reason upon the testimony of others, in a matter which he could, and therefore ought to have advanced only upon the evidence of his own examination? Are not the works of such an author, instead of having a title to be received and considered as the effect of genius, industry and judgment, to be regarded as a mere compilation? And while we pay a just tribute of applause to the beauties of his style, are we not forced to withdraw our confidence and respect from such a writer, as a genuine author?

Between the time that Mr. HUNTER made this discovery and Mr. POTT's publication, which was four years, did no opportunity occur among the number of executed criminals, that had been brought to Surgeons Hall for dissection, that Mr. POTT might have examined such a case himself, before he addressed the world as an author on the subject? Not that I mean to build very high expectations upon the anatomical researches of Surgeons Hall. A display of the skeletons of miserable murderers is, I believe, the principal mark of its eminence, and the only discoverable fruit of its industry.

The two parts of the last passage convey a positive misinformation. Mr. POTT says, "Nor is this mistake of discoloured mucus for matter," &c.—"and though the discharge ITSELF, *when PROPERLY examined, will always prove the contrary.*"——

An undesigning and uninformed reader will perhaps conclude that Mr. POTT is in possession of this knowledge, and knows this to be true; such a reader will be very much surprised to learn, that there is not the least foundation for his last assertion. That is, there is no way yet discovered, by which these discharges can be examined so as to prove, that there is a determined difference, or that pus does or does not come from an ulcerated surface.

Mr. POTT's assertion, therefore, in this particular is a palpable piece of misinformation, and therefore is to be considered as a trumpery ostentatious affectation of a knowledge that he does not possess, conveyed in the following words: "*when properly examined.*" It looks as if Mr. POTT intended to commit a plagiarism by anticipation: for the truth is, that some gentlemen

were engaged in experiments to endeavour to determine the peculiar properties of pus, but the misfortune is, they have not yet succeeded. Had they succeeded, then, Mr. P O R T, possibly, would have claimed a knowledge he did not possess. For a proved plagiarist, who asserts what is not founded, is liable to be suspected of any thing connected with plagiarism.

With a laboured, and at the same time a very artificial endeavour to appear intelligent, we shall find, that, one of the chief characteristics of Mr. P O R T's works is ambiguity.—Let us examine the following passage.

“Whoever” (says Mr. P O R T) “will attend to the discharge made from a purulent ulcer, will find it widely different from that which issues from either of the above parts in gonorrhoea.”

Every one knows as well as Mr. P O R T, that this discharge possesses, at least, one difference. That is the specific poison. I state this, not because I think Mr. P O R T alludes to this difference, for I believe he does not; but in order to cut him off from the advantage evidently intended to be taken by the ambiguity of this part of the passage.

“Whoever will attend—will find it widely different.”

By the word *attend* can Mr. P O R T be supposed to inform us, that the one matter will produce disease, and the other will not?—If so, assuredly this would be no new information.

But taking it in its obvious meaning, the word *attend* must be received as meaning an examination of these discharges *per se*, and that they would be found widely different. Nay he gives us to understand, that to do this, is so very easy, that *whoever* will do it will find it so.

This is positive misinformation. The truth is, that, although we know that the gonorrhoeal discharge does not come from an ulcerated surface, yet this knowledge we owe to an examination of the parts, and not to any mode yet discovered of examining or attending to the discharge itself, as asserted by Mr. P O R T.

Mr. H U N T E R first taught us, that there were no ulcerations, as we have seen. But Mr. P O R T, in his plagiarism from Mr. G A T A K E R, adds, that there is *no abscess*.

—“There is neither matter, nor ulcer, nor *ABSCESS*,” says he. Why did Mr. P O R T think it necessary to tell us, that there is no *abscess*



in the common gonorrhœa? Might he not as well have told us there is neither hair nor hoofs, &c. &c. &c. In short, such weak and unworthy aims at perspicuity mark the height of affectation.

A very celebrated historical writer has said of a forger in historical facts: "No maxim seems to be more certain than this, that a forger is often apt to prove *too much*, but seldom falls into the error of proving *too little*."

Whether the want of genuineness in Mr. POTT's writings is in any measure supported by his endeavours to prove too much is a question I shall leave the reader to determine.

The reader having seen the proofs, can entertain no difficulty in assenting to the charge of plagiarism against Mr. POTT, and that he has no right whatever to be quoted as the author of the opinion that the gonorrhœal discharge is not pus but an increased secretion; and therefore holding him up as such is only decking him out in false or borrowed colours.

As Mr. POTT has taken no notice of the case published by Mr. SHARPE in his *Critical Enquiry*, we are necessarily obliged to consider him, either as not having known it, or, knowing it, not understanding how to apply it. The omission of this case, in addition to the charge of plagiarism, goes directly to prove, that instead of affording any new or rational information, Mr. POTT's pamphlet, in truth, contains less on the subject of pus than was known and even published before his work made its appearance.

Mr. FOOT concludes this part with a compliment to Mr. POTT, which, considering the facts we have just perused, does not seem to have a very solid foundation; not resting upon the strength of his own language, which, without any compliment, was at least equal to the task, he calls in to his aid that giant of literature, the late Dr. JOHNSON, whose mind was as pure as truth, and whose compliment must have flattered the proudest.

Mr. FOOT's quotation from Dr. JOHNSON, is given in such a manner, that if I had not had such repeated instances of his mistakes, I must have believed that Dr. JOHNSON had applied the following words to

Mr. POTT, which Mr. FOOT gives exactly in this manner: "he has  
 "not only lengthened, but gladdened life."\*

The truth is, Dr. JOHNSON did not pay Mr. POTT this compliment, and the quotation is a misrepresentation of Dr. JOHNSON's original text.

The passage alluded to will be found in Dr. JOHNSON's Lives of the English Poets, (p. 525.) where he is speaking of GILBERT WALMSLEY, in the life of SMITH.

—"At this man's table (says Dr. JOHNSON) I enjoyed many  
 "cheerful and instructive hours, with companions such as are not often  
 "found; with *one* who has *lengthened*, and *one* who has *gladdened* life;  
 "with Dr. JAMES, whose skill in physic will be long remembered;  
 "and with DAVID GARRICK, whom I hoped to have gratified with  
 "this character of our common friend."

Let us for a little leave the pursuit of misrepresentations, and endeavour to examine the consistency of Mr. FOOT's observations. I own there are some passages that I am unable to reconcile with any idea of consistency. But I wish the reader to judge for himself.

Mr. FOOT, p. 109, assures us, "If an expression has escaped me,  
 "that may be construed *personal* to the professor, I desire once for all  
 "to say, that I never can mean it, for the professor has my esteem and  
 "respect."

That Mr. FOOT should misunderstand Mr. HUNTER's meaning, admits of some excuse; but that he should not know what he means himself, is a declaration of a most humiliating nature indeed. If the following passage is not personal, I own I am at a loss to understand what it is.

P. 59. "I trust," (says Mr. FOOT) "I shall hear no more of the  
 "unimportant *vanity* of sympathy, a new fangled appropriation, and  
 "equally discordant here, as the word *accommodate* was to BARDOLPH:  
 "this (continues Mr. FOOT) is my *jocular* opinion of it; but I am  
 "deceived if my readers have not found it out as soon as I, to be a *mon-  
 "strous imposition*."

\* JOHNSON.

Mr.



Mr. FOOT has certainly a very new way of being jocular. But how far sympathy is to be considered as an imposition, we may gather from Mr. FOOT's own words, p. 5, where he says—"I wish to be indulged to sympathise with him (Mr. HUNTER) in pleasure." Mr. FOOT, we find, sets out not only with admitting the principle of sympathy, but wishing to be indulged to sympathise with Mr. HUNTER—in pleasure. The pleasure, I suppose, is, to participate a half crown's worth of the great work. How extraordinary it is that Mr. FOOT should declare sympathy to be a monstrous imposition!

If this passage about sympathy is not personal towards Mr. HUNTER, what must we say to the following in p. 63.

"I am told" (says Mr. FOOT) "by *authorities that cannot be disputed*, that the professor addresses his pupils somewhat after the following manner: "Gentlemen, I observe that many of you take notes, I would advise you to burn them; for although what I deliver now is my opinion to day, in another course, I may change this opinion."

I would as soon believe, that Mr. HUNTER advised his pupils to set fire to his museum, and therefore I shall not pay the reader so bad a compliment as to add any thing on this part, but that I cannot help considering it as a monstrous imposition.

In p. 108, Mr. FOOT exhibits the charge of contradiction against Mr. HUNTER's opinion upon the subject

"*Of the Treatment of the swelled Testicle.*"

This undoubtedly is a charge of a very serious nature, and if Mr. FOOT had made it good, it must have diminished our confidence in Mr. HUNTER's opinion. The reader will please to observe the manner in which Mr. FOOT has made his quotation, and opposed what he calls his *counter* paragraph, in order to establish this charge.

The beginning in Italics is a portion of the first paragraph to which Mr. FOOT has added the beginning of the next paragraph, as if it connected immediately, and was so in the original text. The following is just as Mr. FOOT has fabricated them.

"*It is generally a long time before the swelling of the testicle entirely subsides.* It is still much longer before the epididymis comes to its natural

“tural state, and indeed often years before it returns to its natural size  
 “and softness, and sometimes it never does.” [This paragraph will be  
 found to be fabricated out of two, and the full stops are misrepresenta-  
 tions.]

“The reader (continues Mr. FOOT) will be pleased to mark the  
 “counter paragraph to the above from page 58.

“A swelled testicle, in consequence of the radical cure in the hy-  
 “drocele, does not subside after inflammation is gone, in as many  
 “weeks as the swelled testicle, in consequence of its sympathy with  
 “other parts, does in days; and probably the reason of this is,  
 “that it arises from sympathy.”—“Only (observes Mr. FOOT) let  
 “men alone who set off upon a wrong theory, and they will entangle  
 “themselves. If I were *invidiously* to seek for contradictions, I should  
 “despair of coming ever to a conclusion.”

I will venture to assert that a more flagrant violation of fact is not to  
 be found than this pretended quotation of Mr. HUNTER's text, as  
 will be seen by perusing the original text, which is as follows.

Mr. HUNTER on the treatment of the swelled testicle, p. 92, says,  
 “It is generally a long time before the swelling of the testicle entirely subsides,”  
 [here Mr. FOOT made the full stop, and left out all the remaining  
 part of the paragraph as follows] “although it does so more quickly AT  
 “FIRST than swellings of this part arising from other CAUSES; but  
 “when the inflammation is removed, and the swelling only remains,  
 “evacuations never are of service. Before it becomes less, it generally  
 “becomes softer, commonly on the anterior surface, and this goes on  
 “till the whole becomes perhaps softer than natural, and then it di-  
 “minishes.”

What now follows is the next paragraph, which by turning back it  
 will be found Mr. FOOT had tacked to the first portion of the pre-  
 ceding paragraph.

“It is still much longer before the epididymis comes to its natural state,  
 “and indeed it is often years before it returns to its natural size and softness,  
 “and sometimes it never does,” [here again Mr. FOOT makes a full stop  
 though the context runs as follows] “however, this is of no great con-  
 “sequence, as there is no inconvenience arising from the hardness  
 “simply;



“ simply; though sometimes I am inclined to believe such testicles are rendered totally useless. I never, &c.”

For what purpose could Mr. FOOT have altered and misrepresented Mr. HUNTER's original text? Why put a full stop at *subides*, and leave out the immediate following context, containing A T F I R S T, and join the beginning of the next paragraph to it, as if it was the original text?

Notwithstanding these repeated misrepresentations in the observations, Mr. FOOT in the following passage, p. 32, professes at least to possess the spirit of candour. “ I trust (says he) that my readers will not attribute any quotations that I make to a desire of trespassing on their patience, or swelling this pamphlet. Nor am I ambitious, *however highly I respect the talents of the professor in general*, of idly ingrafting into my humble performance what so particularly belongs here to him. But that the professor may not have a WRONG CONSTRUCTION put upon his MEANING BY ME, it is as necessary to MY CHARACTER and to his own as *the cause of truth*.”

From what we have seen, this last declaration requires no comment.

### *Of the Cure of the Gonorrhœa.*

Advantage has been taken of some of Mr. HUNTER's expressions in this chapter, and it has been asserted as his doctrine that all gonorrhœas cure themselves, and that medicine can be of no use. By reading of the chapters on this subject, it will appear that this does not convey Mr. HUNTER's opinion. The following passages seem to have given ground for the report I have just mentioned. In p. 69, Mr. HUNTER says.

“ As we have no specific medicine for gonorrhœas, it is fortunate that time alone will effect a cure; it is therefore very reasonable to suppose that every such inflammation gets well of itself.”—Again—“ Upon this idea of every gonorrhœa curing itself, I gave certain patients pills of bread, which were taken with great regularity. The patients always got well, but some of them I believe not so soon as they would have done had the artificial methods of cure been employed.”

In.

In the first place we see that Mr. HUNTER does not affirm or advance it as his opinion that the inflammation gets well of itself, but only thinks it reasonable to suppose it does, as we have no specific medicine for the cure of this discharge. In the second he believes that from the want of the artificial methods of cure the patients did not get well so soon as they would have done had they been used. Does this warrant us to say that it is Mr. HUNTER's doctrine, that medicines are useless in the cure of gonorrhœa? Or does it follow, that, because it is possible for this discharge to be cured without art, any surgeon would give up his patients to the consequences.

Though it can hardly be necessary to observe that here the cure of the gonorrhœa alludes merely to that of the discharge itself, yet Mr. FOOT seems to have confounded the cure of the gonorrhœa, with the cure or prevention of its consequences. They are undoubtedly very separate and distinct considerations. The discharge considered abstractedly, however disagreeable and tedious it may in some cases prove, is certainly a disorder of very small importance, compared to the diseases which spring from it when the virus has not been eradicated, or when the constitution has suffered, in consequence of not having been guarded by artificial means.

So far is Mr. HUNTER from thinking the use of medicines ultimately not necessary in the cure of gonorrhœa, that he has even enforced it in the following passages. In p. 86.

“ Whatever methods (says he) are used for the cure either locally  
“ or constitutionally, *it is always necessary to have in view* the possibility  
“ of some of the matter being absorbed, and afterwards appearing in the  
“ form of a lues venerea; to prevent which I should be inclined to give  
“ small doses of mercury internally.”

Again, p. 87, “ It is however going upon the surest grounds to give  
“ mercury, as we may reasonably suppose it will often prevent a lues  
“ venerea.” And the fact is that (in p. 15,) Mr. HUNTER has given the cases of a patient, who at two different times was cured of gonorrhœa without the precaution of mercurials, and was, in consequence, both times poxed.

Though for my own part I do not see where the difficulty is of understanding Mr. HUNTER on this subject, yet Mr. FOOT, p. 83, tells



tells us.—“ There may be more in his (Mr. HUNTER's) reason than  
 “ is dreamt of in my philosophy ; but I cannot find it out. *I confess*  
 “ *my incapacity.*” This may be candid enough, but how can we be-  
 lieve what Mr. FOOT declares, p. 92, he says—“ I firmly believe that  
 “ there is not a pupil of two months standing in this city who does not  
 “ know *all the remedies* remarked upon by the professor, as well  
 “ as I do.

We may very safely presume that a pupil of two months standing in  
 this or any other city knows very little, or indeed nothing of these or  
 any other medicinal remedies. Can this be the fact with Mr. FOOT?  
 Justice to him obliges me to believe that he has misrepresented himself.

The concluding part of the above quotation is a curiosity.—“ That  
 “ they (the pupils) may choose to throw away the worse part of  
 “ them, *I will not deny*, and PERHAPS they may *be in the right if they*  
 “ *did.*” Mr. FOOT finds fault with Mr. HUNTER for the use of this  
 word, but here is a perhaps that defies competition, in all the writers at  
 least that I have ever read.

To throw aside the worst part of remedies, and to adopt the most pro-  
 per has been considered as one of the principal and most important de-  
 grees of knowledge in medicine. But we are told that *perhaps* it might  
 be right to do so.

I believe no man of experience, knowledge, or common sense, will  
 hesitate to believe that in the treatment of every curable disorder, the  
 more skilfully and the more regularly it is attended to, the sooner and  
 the more certain the cure will be. In a disorder, like the gonorrhœa,  
 which is subject to such variety, and capable of rousing so many imme-  
 diate symptoms, and of leaving behind it at least one of the most offen-  
 sive diseases the human subject is liable to, skilful and regular attention  
 is undoubtedly necessary in order to guard the constitution, and to pre-  
 vent future ill consequences.

That some cases are cured with much less trouble than others, every  
 surgeon of experience has found. In some patients the symptoms will  
 be much milder than in others ; but though this is the truth, yet the  
 mildness of the symptoms depends undoubtedly very much upon skilful

treatment. In virulent cases it may be said entirely to depend upon the skill of the surgeon, and though we cannot cure the discharge with certainty, yet we certainly can prevent its producing a *lues venerea*.

It is a position that every man of extensive practice in London could easily and truly maintain, that there are more constitutions injured and undone by mismanagement in venereal cases, than can be imputed to all the other accidents that mankind are liable to.

Mr. FOOT, p. 72, says, " And last of all what is more evident, " and more important than all I have hitherto said."

By way of discovering the truth of this position, let us examine the observations on this chapter a little further.

Notwithstanding what we have just read from Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FOOT confounds the cure of gonorrhœa with the cure or prevention of its consequences, and p. 73, he says what may be very true, but it does not oppose Mr. HUNTER's doctrine. The words I allude to are—" The remainder of life will be a miserable entail upon the deluded " subject, who fallaciously is advised to wait for his gonorrhœa to cure itself."

And in the continuation will be seen how manifestly he confounds the cure of gonorrhœa with its consequences—" or who fallaciously persuades himself that there is no specific power yet known, " which cures a gonorrhœa by depriving the virus of the power of action, " either in the form of gonorrhœa, or any other form arising out " of it."

The virus may be destroyed, and certainly it often is, long before the gonorrhœa is cured. But as to depriving the virus of the power of action, it is an expression not applicable to any known or plain ideas of disease.

Mr. FOOT goes on " The Orthodoxy of the professor will be found " to be heretical, or there is no truth in divination." Mr. FOOT might as well have said, that Mr. HUNTER's fire will be found ice, as it is impossible to find orthodoxy heretical. But it would be a waste of time to notice things of this sort. Let us examine what Mr. FOOT calls the importance of what he has said.

Mr. FOOT



Mr F o o r goes on and illustrates his notion of a gonorrhœa, and its cure, in a metaphorical way, and opposes his objection to what he has supposed Mr. H U N T E R's doctrine.

—" Suppose (says he) a house in flames, how ridiculous it is to bring the fire engines ! What an useless set of people the firemen are ! What nonsense to take *precautions of insurance* ! When if you only permit the fire to continue till the house be burnt down to the ground, the flames will not only tire themselves out, but in the end be quite extinguished."

This I suppose is all meant for wit ; let us see if there be any sense or truth in it.

I do not know, because I have not heard of an Insurance-office against gonorrhœa yet. If Mr. F o o r knows that there is such a place, I have only to add that he has not been so good as to inform the public. But what analogy is there between putting out a fire, and the cure of a gonorrhœa ? We know that a house on fire will be certainly extinguished by a sufficient quantity of water. It is a specific cure. But is there any medicine or application for gonorrhœa that taken or applied in any quantity will certainly cure it ? Undoubtedly there is none such, and those who pretend there is, only mean to impose on the credulous, or to puff themselves off for a knowledge they do not possess.

I do not mean by this to have it understood that gonorrhœa is not commonly cured, or that the cure is not generally accelerated by the use of medicines and topical applications. This would be far from the fact. My object is to state what cannot be denied, that there is no medicine that can be termed specific, yet discovered for the cure of gonorrhœa. And in some constitutions we know that the discharge will continue many months even after the virus is destroyed, and every other symptom is cured. As the running at length stops, Mr. H U N T E R think that the parts tire themselves out " by a continuance of the same action."

Mr. F o o r, not without some humour, grows metaphorical again, p. 82, and thinks this is applied to every case, and equivalent to comparing the gonorrhœa to a runaway horse, and the doctrine to Mr. H U N T E R telling his patients,—“ Go,” says he, (Mr. H U N T E R) to

the patient, "you have got a runaway horse, I can make you no bridle  
 " *that will govern him*; when he gallops away with you, spur him on;  
 " tire him, and he will stop of himself; you may coax him to stop if  
 " you can; but if neither will avail, I say again, keep your seat, and  
 " tire him out."

There may be humour here, but it certainly wants what is essential—application. Mr. HUNTER gives nothing like the idea here conveyed of spurring him on, or that we have no bridle to guide this runaway horse. On the contrary, he forbids spurring; we have many bridles to guide, though we have none to stop him with absolute certainty. Nor could it be safe to stop him suddenly, if we had. And following Mr. FOOT's metaphor, a skilful surgeon can only shew his abilities truly by guiding this animal in his mad career till the rider can dismount, safe and sound. This doctrine is applicable to many other diseases as well as the venereal.

---

Mr. FOOT, agreeably to his promise, has also favoured the world with the second part of his observations on Mr. HUNTER's work. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that we have seen enough to be convinced that the observations are written in a language of a peculiar sort, and, the second part maintains that peculiarity so well, that it is but justice to acknowledge that so far it is consistent with the first. In confirmation of this, I shall take notice of some parts of Mr. FOOT's address to the reader; and though I intend to be as short as possible on this second part, yet, I beg the reader may believe that I have not taken any particular pains to select, for I have no doubt but every page would afford clear ground for stricture or refutation. Mr. FOOT begins his second part in a warm and satisfied tone.

"I should (says he) have fulfilled my promise at any rate, but since  
 " my first part has been so well received, I am now doubly bound to  
 " do my duty."

This



This cannot be considered as a direct puff; for a direct puff is a gross thing, and this is delicately expressed; besides, there is the symptom of gratitude here, which has always, and upon all occasions been held in the highest respect. It may be objected, if Mr. FOOT's first part was generally known to have been well received, that his information on this point was not very necessary. But the less necessary it was, the more we ought to be obliged to him for taking the trouble.

"He, (continues Mr. FOOT) who is insensible to the *pleasure arising* from a *fond ambition* for *honest fame*, must be a *stoic* of no happy condition of mind."

The classical reader will no doubt be surprised to hear of this new species of stoics. That a stoic should admit that he can either be happy or unhappy from circumstances, is a doctrine contrary to that which Zeno taught. But Mr. FOOT new models every thing to his own purpose, and we have less cause to complain of his misrepresenting new doctrines, who makes no difficulty of confounding one of the most ancient.

"If (continues Mr. FOOT) to think, and to act as we think, had ever any accordance, I trust that my reader, and *it is upon him that I place all my confidence*, will believe, in this instance, they are in the most perfect harmony."

This placing all his confidence in his reader, is a modest manner of telling us that he does not place any great dependance on himself; and yet he soon after tells us,

"I stake the little reputation I have earned, upon the purity of my motives, and the *strength* of my assertions."

As to the purity or impurity of any man's motives, they can only at best be guessed at by his actions. No assertion, however strong, can be placed in the balance against plain proof. But by the time Mr. FOOT gets to page 42, he seems to change his ground entirely, for there he says,

"For my own part, I have carefully avoided throughout my observations resting *any assertion* upon my *bare* authority; for which reason, whenever I have objected to the theory of the professor, I have chosen rather to oppose him by the opinions of others, than to be too confident in my own experience; I know its fallibility."——

First

First we find Mr. FOOT places *all* his confidence in his reader.—He then stakes his reputation upon the purity of his motives, and the strength of his assertions—but lastly he declares, that he does not rest any assertion upon his own bare authority, not being too confident in his own experience, as he knows its fallibility!!!

Mr. FOOT professes not to have *imposed* any opinion upon his reader that was not his sincerest, and in p. 3. he says, “ *First of all* I must “ beg to be indulged with a moment’s attention of my readers to what “ refers to myself.”

Before I favor the reader with what immediately follows this, I must beg leave to throw in a doubt that the expression of *first of all* is a parody on that passage in the Rehearsal, where the physician begins with *Sir, to conclude*, What! says Mr. SMITH, “ before he begins!” Mr. FOOT proceeds to his third page, and then he says *first of all*.

“ It has been (continues Mr. FOOT) more than *once* insinuated to “ my friends, that I must have been *induced* to these observations on “ the new opinions of the professor, from some previous provocation. “ Such a suspicion cannot be better answered than by referring my “ readers to my last publication, where, *I flatter myself*, they will find “ sufficient cause from the *palpable objections* I have offered to his theory “ even if I had stopped there.”

Whether Mr. FOOT was induced by a previous or subsequent provocation, I shall not take upon me to determine. It is of very little consequence to the world what were the motives. They have only to determine whether the observations are founded in truth, in reason, and in judgment, and the friends of Mr. HUNTER will probably agree with Mr. FOOT, that the suspicion cannot be better answered than by a reference to his last publication.

“ Let it no more be said (says Mr. FOOT) that I either seek the “ enmity of him whose new opinions I oppose, or the ridicule of his “ friendship;”—

The reader has not forgotten that Mr. FOOT in his last publication (p. 110) declares that Mr. HUNTER has his “ esteem and respect,” And now, disclaiming any previous provocation, he speaks of the *ridicule of his friendship*.

These



These may be but trifling inconsistencies, and men of genius are not to be tied down to the ordinary rules of consistency.

Though it is my wish to yield the reader every gratification in my power, yet, I must be excused from dwelling upon every exceptionable particular. To point out some of the principal and more prominent features will be sufficient to give an idea of the original, without any unnecessary waste of time in attempting to make a more finished picture of a subject that does not appear to be entitled to such attention.

Whether it be owing to that principle which Mr. FOOT calls the "high effect of contrast," or whether they are to be considered in common language as mere contradictions in terms, I shall not take upon me to determine; but undoubtedly there are passages in the two parts of the observations that cannot be reconciled to each other by the plain rules of common sense.

"In the first part we found Mr. FOOT declining—"to dispute with the professor upon grammar for many delicate reasons."—But now, p. 9. he exclaims—"and this is the explanation of an *eminent* logician, who is a candidate for fame through the way of new opinions!"

However unwilling Mr. FOOT appears to be to allow Mr. HUNTER's merits, yet, he is very willing to admit the probability of his domestics possessing a greater share of discernment than is usually found among persons of this description.

"For example, (says Mr. FOOT, p. 13) if one of his domestics were asked whether the professor was not a great anatomist? The answer in all probability would be, can a duck swim! But if the same domestic were asked if he be a learned writer, and a man of great judgment? There this very proverb would fail in the application, it would stick in his throat, for it would not confirm him in these excellencies."

As Mr. FOOT's book may, by virtue of the commercial treaty, be soon translated into French, what an elevated idea must this passage convey to our new friends of the qualifications of English domestics?

If

If Mr. FOOT wanders from his subject, we must believe, that it cannot always be imputed to willfulness, for he tells us, p. 36.

“ As my intention is never to lose sight of the new opinions of the professor, I am always watchful to detect myself when I am episodically deviating into extraneous enquiries.”

Mr. FOOT's intention of never losing sight of Mr. HUNTER's new opinions is a resolution that must be highly approved. But it seems very strange, that as Mr. FOOT is always watchful when he is episodically deviating into extraneous enquiries, that his vigilance has been attended with so little success. For my own part, I should be apprehensive that without the deviations the observations would be nothing. For instance, what spirit and conviction does the following passage carry along with it?

“ I have (says Mr. FOOT, p. 50.) before me many pages so loaded with rubbish, so many useless sets of distinctions, sections so narrative and inapplicable stood in my way, as Hercules himself would turn from, and consider in the comparison his Augéan task a pleasure.”—

How neat and delicate is the idea of rubbish applied to the work Mr. FOOT has undertaken to favour the world with observations upon? And though it modestly conveys that, he must become literary scavenger to clear it out of his way, yet, he certainly keeps up his consequence, by telling us that Hercules himself would have turned from the task he has undertaken.

As a specimen of this difficulty that Mr. FOOT must have suffered in making observations, I shall lay before the reader *in toto* what Mr. FOOT says, p. 106.

“ P. 153. *Of the Treatment of the Inflammation in the surrounding Parts.*”

“ The first line (observes Mr. FOOT) of the professor runs thus:  
“ The inflammation of these parts is to be treated like other inflammations.”

Let the reader judge for himself what difficulty Mr. FOOT must have been in to have found this out, and if this be not an observation that demands



demands our most respectful attention? Yet in p. 108, will be found the following.

Page 156. VI. *Of Fistulae in Perinaeo.*

The professor says, " I apprehend that the bougie may bring on an inflammation on the urethra at the obstructed part, and produce adhesions there." ' Here (observes Mr. FOOT) adhesions from inflammation on the urethra comes confessedly forward, and the new opinion sinks, and is lost in the general acceptance; "

This observation I have given the reader in full, that he may profit as well as he can by the information it conveys; I shall only add, *ex pede Herculem.*

I am now come to a subject where I shall also lay before the reader the whole that Mr. FOOT has said and quoted, and afterwards, the original text from Mr. HUNTER. In Mr. FOOT (p. 120,) it runs thus.

IV. " *Cure of a Paralysis of the Urethra.*"

This title is the whole of the original text that Mr. FOOT favours us with, and he proceeds

" The cure would be the same for debility of the bladder and muscles. His remedies are blisters to the loin and perinaeum, tincture of cantharides, spices and steel, bark, cold water, and one of his " *PER-HAPSES.*" If electricity should fail, I will furnish him with another " *perhaps;*" he is fond of comparative science. What says he to the " idea of retaining the ablest whistler to horses from Newmarket? " Horses hard ridden have been thus relieved. I wish the professor " *seriously* to weigh the importance of this hint."

What will the reader say when he is assured that the word *perhaps* is not in this whole section in Mr. HUNTER's original text. Mr. FOOT, p. 12. says, " my readers must excuse me if I become ridiculous"—If we must excuse Mr. FOOT for becoming ridiculous, why *we must*, as Whiskerandos says in Sheridan's Critic, though at first, I did not think that Mr. FOOT was in earnest. But to accuse a writer of having made use of a word in a particular section where no such word is, if that be not ridiculous, I know not what it is.

By perusing the original text, I believe the reader will be convinced that Mr. FOOT has thrown no new light upon the subject, but rather obscured than elucidated the matter.

#### IV. "Cure of the Paralysis of the Urethra."

"It is to be cured by stimulants, as a blister to the loins, or a blister to the perinæum. Putting the feet into cold water may be useful. Cantharides taken internally, fifteen or twenty drops once or twice a day, according to their effects, are of singular service in some cases.

"A man came to St. George's hospital with this complaint. I ordered him the before-mentioned medicine, and it had such an effect as to bring on the contrary disease, or a spasmodic affection of the urethra, so that he could not make water when he had the inclination; but an injection of opium removed this complaint, and he was then well. In this case, a few drops less probably would have effected a cure without any inconvenience.

"Spices and steel medicines are of service; and from what was said before of the bark I should suppose it a good medicine. Electricity may also be tried. Washing the parts with cold water may probably be of service."

HUNTER'S *Treatise*, p. 166.

The idea that Mr. FOOT has favoured us with about whistling is certainly very curious, and applied in a very new manner to the paralysis of the urethra. But I am not convinced that it is absolutely necessary to send to Newmarket for a whistler, if Mr. FOOT's idea should be adopted, and in delicacy to the gentlemen of the law, who are usually retained, a whistler may be *hired* instead of being *retained* as Mr. FOOT has it. However, even in a professed wit, the diseases of mankind are certainly not a proper subject of ridicule.

#### Of Impotence.

Mr. FOOT has commenced his observations upon this chapter, with a quotation which is fabricated by taking part of the first paragraph,

and



and putting a full stop in the middle of the passage, and then adding the latter part of the next paragraph to it. This kind of management I have noticed before. By this the original text is mutilated and misrepresented.

Reprehensible as this mode of making quotations may be, yet, in candour, it must be allowed, that there are passages in this chapter which might have been very properly omitted by Mr. HUNTER, or more fortunately expressed. Had Mr. FOOT objected to these in a manner suitable to the subject, he would for once have stood upon just ground, and might have been listened to with attention, if not with respect.

But Mr. FOOT seems impatient to display the powers of his imagination, and that the reader may not be deprived of such a delicate *morceau*, I give him the following passage.

"I can easily figure (says Mr. FOOT, p. 141,) in my mind the professor *enthroned* in his elbow chair at his lecture room, surrounded by his pupils, not exactly such a group as Apollo in company with his nine muses. I can *figure* the professor, not having exactly the front of Jove, nor the eye of Mars, but with a contour of his own."

What wonderful proofs of a figurative imagination are here displayed! Though it appears more the effect of a disordered than a fertile imagination to figure a lecturer on surgery enthroned in an elbow chair, yet, the particular acquaintances of Jove and Mars, if they are not informed what sort of face Mr. HUNTER has, are certainly told what sort of face he has not. This may be considered as a very shrewd observation, and very aptly introduced on this subject. But the concluding part contains a piece of intelligence, which, though Mr. FOOT has given as the effect of a figurative imagination, most people would be able to guess at without any great exertion of this faculty, namely, that Mr. HUNTER has "a contour of his own."

Too long have books on chirurgical subjects been unadorned with such beautiful flashes of fancy, but when they become generally introduced, people will then perhaps be induced to read them, if not for information, at least for amusement.

*Of the Decay of the Testicle.*

I am glad to observe, that previous to Mr. FOOT entering upon his observations on this chapter, he has given a quotation of more than five lines which is faithful to the material text.

Mr. HUNTER has taken notice that the testicles "are later of coming to maturity than any other parts, and are more liable to decay."

In opposition to this Mr. FOOT observes, p. 145, "So unfortunate is the professor in all his assertions. He says that the testicle is more than other parts liable to decay, and now he is going to give us the rarest of all instances! This is the natural genius of man!"

But in order to have disproved that the testicles are more liable to decay than other parts, it was necessary to state, and to prove the parts that are. But instead of doing this, Mr. FOOT has rested his contradiction of an established fact, upon no better ground than his bare assertion.

"Testicles (says Mr. HUNTER) have been known to waste in consequence of rupture, probably from the constant pressure of the intestine. Mr. POTT has given us cases of this kind."

Against this, Mr. FOOT observes. "I have just remarked, that the professor is singularly unfortunate in all his assertions; it gives me great pain to be constantly contradicting him, but I do here flatly," and why? "because (adds Mr. FOOT) it must place the one or the other of us in a mean and most disgraceful situation."

Mr. FOOT's avowed motive for contradicting Mr. HUNTER flatly, because it must place him, or Mr. HUNTER, in a mean and most disgraceful situation, may serve to throw some light on the observations, but affords no great proof of a liberal intention. He adds,

"Mr. POTT has given us three cases of the wasting of the testicles, and not one of them was in consequence of rupture, nor had either of the patients ever a rupture."

The three cases alluded to by Mr. FOOT, are 36, 37, and 38, in Mr. POTT's treatise on the hydrocele. That these cases of the wasting

of



of the testicle were not in consequence of rupture, it was not necessary to be informed by Mr. FOOT. But, that neither of these patients *ever* had a rupture, is a piece of information which does not appear from what Mr. PORT has written. We must therefore believe, in justice to Mr. FOOT, that he was told so privately by Mr. PORT himself. Whether these patients ever had a rupture or not, will be found of little consequence to the present question.

Mr. FOOT in the following passage attempts to insinuate that Mr. PORT has given no case of wasted testicle owing to rupture. His words are,

“ But the professor, not content to find out in the name of Mr. PORT, that *the* cases he had given us of the decay of the testicle “ were owing to rupture, when Mr. PORT had never made any such “ assertion, has also helped him out in accounting for the rupture “ producing the decay of the testicle.”

In the first place, it is a clear misrepresentation, to assert, that Mr. HUNTER has said, that *the* cases Mr. PORT had given us of the decay of the testicle were owing to rupture. Mr. HUNTER has said that Mr. PORT has given us cases of this kind, and to assert that Mr. PORT has not, is undoubtedly doing him an injustice.

It must appear a little odd that Mr. FOOT should take us to Mr. PORT's treatise on the hydrocele for the effect of rupture on the testicle. Yet if he had read the case 37 with attention, he would have found that, after relating the case of a man whose testicle was destroyed in consequence of a blow on the groin, Mr. PORT has added the following.

“ I once saw the same effect, from the injudicious application of a “ truss on a true cirfocele, the vessels by means of the pressure, became “ enlarged to a prodigious size, but the testicle shrunk to almost “ nothing.”

It is too often the misfortune of Mr. PORT's language that it leaves room for conjecture where the utmost perspicuity is absolutely necessary. Mr. PORT does not say that this patient had not a rupture, and as we know that the cirfocele is often complicated with rupture, particularly

cularly where trusses are improperly applied, we must believe that this was a compound case, and that the truss pressing improperly had produced the effect he has stated, of the truth of which we cannot entertain a doubt. Nor can we say that this patient had not a rupture without charging Mr. POTT with having expressed himself in a very improper manner. For, if this case had been mistaken for a rupture, he could not with propriety have spoken of the injudicious application of a truss. I say, if we can place, in this instance, any dependence upon the propriety of Mr. POTT's words, we cannot hesitate to conclude that this patient had a rupture, because, to speak of the injudicious application of a truss, where it could not be applied with judgement, would be a solecism in language.

Why Mr. POTT has omitted to state this consequence of the injudicious application of a truss in its proper place, in his treatise on ruptures, is a question to which it does not appear very easy to give a satisfactory answer. However, that there is a case in Mr. POTT's treatise on ruptures of a decayed testicle, where the patient had a rupture, will be found beyond all question or doubt, by perusing the note, p. 67, 68. The rupture was of fourteen years standing, and upon examination after death, he says,—“The testicle, included in its *tunica vaginalis*, was *much* wasted.”

The truth is, that the testicles are so susceptible of injury, that they are not only liable to be wasted by rupture, as well as the injudicious application of trusses, but, it is very well known, that they are seldom found perfect in cases of hydrocele where the water has remained any considerable time.

Whatever Mr. FOOT's intention may have been, by declaring, that either he or Mr. HUNTER must be placed in a mean and most disgraceful situation, it must now be very obvious that it does not fall to the share of Mr. HUNTER. Nor was it possible even if what Mr. FOOT has asserted concerning the cases of the wasting of the testicle had been the fact; unless it was mean and disgraceful to give Mr. POTT credit for a knowledge he did not possess. In justice to Mr. POTT, I

have



have pointed out the misrepresentation, and I should not have acted with candour if I had not. Let it be observed that where I have opposed Mr. P O T T's writings, I have given the evidence. I have opposed his works, because they were quoted as authentic information without possessing a just claim to be original authority. If I am mistaken, I shall be open to conviction, and ready to acknowledge my error. My object is to discover and to state the truth, and however desirable this object may be, I cannot say with Mr. F O O T,—“ This speculation has proved “ to me so pleasant a one as any in my life.”—To refute misrepresentation may be useful, and just, but, cannot, I think, be pleasant.

From the evidence we have examined, the following conclusions may be drawn. That Mr. F O O T has misrepresented Mr. H U N T E R's opinions: That he has misrepresented Dr. J O H N S O N: That he has misrepresented Mr. P O T T's works: And lastly, it is to be hoped that he has misrepresented himself; I say, it is to be hoped, because I cannot take upon me to say positively that he has, and Mr. F O O T has told us that he stakes the little reputation he has acquired upon the strength of his assertions. For all this, I repeat, I hope he has misrepresented himself, because I am unwilling to believe that he knows as little of the medicinal remedies as a pupil of two months standing.

— *Pudet hæc opprobria* —  
*Et dici potuisse, & non potuisse refelli.*

I shall conclude these strictures with a quotation from Mr. F O O T, p. 149, and leave the reader to admire the peculiarity of the style, and to apply the matter according to his judgment.

“ To see the man of learning and genius imitated; to see wrong  
“ ideas, *more wrong* expressed, piled each upon the other; to hear a  
“ man endeavour to reason *abstruse*, when he cannot reason *plain*; to  
“ hear him talk of objects that exist not, and see him *blind* to such as  
“ are *palpable*; to see illiberal traits which he had with studied art  
“ concealed, with common ease detected; to see pride and vanity con-  
“ fume

“fume themselves by ineffectual efforts. These cannot excite any other  
“emotion but a pleasant one. Thus we are told of a vain philosopher  
“who ran frantic into a society, to show it that he had discovered  
“living monsters in the sun; which proved in the event to be only in-  
“sects in his telescope.”

"to me to present a one as any in my life."—"To relate misprop-  
osition may be useful, and still, but cannot, I think, be pleasant.  
may be, I cannot say with Mr. Todd,—"This speculation has proved  
is to discover, and to state the truth, and however desirable this object  
be open to conviction, and ready to acknowledge my error. My object



“I shall conclude these strictures with a quotation from Mr. Forster, p. 149, and leave the reader to admire the peculiarity of the style, and to apply the matter according to his judgment.